# This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations and is not a part of the Official Record

# **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

# IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents will not correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	N NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,072	09/943,072 08/30/2001		David R. Lindsay	LIDR5001JP	8673
29889	7590	01/22/2003			
OLIVE & (	DLIVE, P	.A.	EXAMINER		
500 MEMORIAL STREET PO BOX 2049				BAKER, MAURIE GARCIA	
DURHAM, NC 27702		2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1639	
			DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/943,072** 

Applicant(S)

Lindsay

Examiner

Maurie G. Bak r, Ph.D.

Art Unit **1639** 



- The MAILING DATE of this communic	cation appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period for Reply	DEDLY IS SET TO EVOIDE ONE MONTH(S) EDOM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT	REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>ONE</u> MONTH(S) FROM TION.
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory processing the specified above.</li> </ul>	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
	statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  e mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b	o)⊠ This action is non-final.
closed in accordance with the practice	allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is under Ex parte Quayle35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
4) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u>	is/are pending in the applica
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from considera
5) 🗌 Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.
7)	is/are objected to.
	are subject to restriction and/or election requirem
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.
10) The drawing(s) filed on	is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed drawing correction filed of	n is: a pproved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are require	ed in reply to this Office action.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
· ·	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some* c) None of:	
Certified copies of the priority docu	
2.  Certified copies of the priority docu	uments have been received in Application No
	e priority documents have been received in this National Stage tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). r a list of the certified copies not received.
14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim fo	·
a) The translation of the foreign language	
_	or domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachment(s)	· · ·
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:

Art Unit: 1639

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restriction

- 1. Claims 1-20 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising various "pharmaceutical compositions", "antagonists" and "dosage forms". Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed. Please see paragraph 3 below.
- 2. In order to avoid potential difficulties with the interpretation of nomenclature and in the interest of compact prosecution, applicant is requested to specifically elect species as set forth below. Election from <u>each</u> species is required.
- 3. Please elect <u>one species of each</u> of the following, for purposes of search:

## Species (1): Pharmaceutical composition

A single, specific pharmaceutical composition should be elected with the active ingredient specifically set forth (e.g. one of the opiates of claim 4/14).

## Species (2): Antagonist

A single, specific antagonist should be elected (e.g. one of those set forth in claim 5/15).

## Species (3): Dosage form

A single, specific dosage form should be elected with all portions thereof defined (i.e. form of *both* pharmaceutical composition and antagonist).

The election above should result in the identification of a fully-defined, single pharmaceutical formulation as claimed in instant claim 1 (and used in the method of

Serial Number: 09/943

Art Unit: 1639

instant claim 11). Support for the species should also be indicated in the instant specification.

- 4. The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made (e.g. formulation conditions). Each of the active compounds have a different pharmaceutical mode of action would require a different antagonist. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter. The different species would require different searches and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden.
- 5. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.
- 6. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and *a listing of all claims* readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Serial Number: 09/943

Art Unit: 1639

- 7. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).
- 8. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 9. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1639

- 11. Applicant is also reminded that a 1 month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for response when a written requirement is made without an action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program, see MPEP 809.02(a).
- 12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:00 to 6:30 and alternate Fridays.
- 13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Wang, can be reached at (703) 306-3217. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.
- 14. **Please Note**: In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1639 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is 703-308-4315. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this Pilot

Art Unit: 1639

program. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

Maurie Garcia Baker, Ph.D. January 16, 2003

MAURIE GARCIA BAKER, Ph.D.
PATENT EXAMINER